

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 2 and 5 have been cancelled, while claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claims 2 and 5. Similarly, claims 10 and 13 have been cancelled, while claim 9 has been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claims 10 and 13.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6, 9-12, 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,091,414 to Kraft, IV et al. The Examiner has further rejected claims 5 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft, IV et al. in view of U.S. Patent 7,200,857 to Rodriguez et al. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 7 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft, IV et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,751,283 to Smith. Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft, IV et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,561,811 to Bier.

Applicants believe that the above changes answer the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection, as well as the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections based on Kraft, IV et al. in view of Smith, and Kraft, IV et al. in view of Bier.

The Kraft, IV et al. patent discloses a system and method for cross-environment interaction in a computerized graphical interface environment, in which two (or more) applications are concurrently running on a processor and have corresponding windows

appearing on the display. The window corresponding to the application with current user focus is distinguished from the other windows (e.g., a different border color, appearing on top of the other windows, etc.). The focused application is provided with more CPU resources relative to remaining tasks, applications, etc.

The Rodriguex et al. patent discloses synchronized video-on-demand supplemental commentary, in which advertisement pop-ups are provided during a movie-on-demand, the Advertisement pip-ups being externally controlled and provided by a media provider.

The Examiner has indicated that Rodriguez teaches a provider of the media information performs the externally controlled step of identifying the application with the current focus of the user.

Applicants believe that the Examiner is mistaken. In particular, while Rodriguez et al. discloses the appearance of pop-ups, there is no disclosure or suggestion that there is a reallocation of the resources of the system such that the pop-up has the current focus of the user.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the subject invention, as claimed, is not rendered obvious by the prior art, either individually or collectively, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11, 12 and 14-17, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611